

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/849,229	05/07/2001	Sung Rong Jo	P0239/US/SH	8060
75	90 12/09/2004		EXAM	INER
McGuire Woods LLP			KRAMER, DEVON C	
1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800 Tysons Corner			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
McLean, VA	22102-3915		3683	
			DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			i
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/849,229	JO, SUNG RONG	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Devon C Kramer	3683	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	9
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 N</u>	lovember 2004.		•
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under I	•		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-4,6-10,12-21 and 2  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 5 11 22 24 25 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	23 is/are withdrawn from consider	ation.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any objection to the	cepted or b) objected to by the		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Applicati Inity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 3683

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1) A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/02/04 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3) Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 14, 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer et al (5096029) in view of Weisenberger (4064910).

Re: claims 1, 22 and 24-25. Bauer et al show in figure 2 a gas opening/closing pin 23 which opens and closes a gas inlet and outlet 55 formed in a pipe holder 12 which seals one end portion of a cylinder 1 and moves the position of a piston 21 in the cylinder, wherein at least one recess portion d" which opens the gas inlet and outlet is formed on a side of the outer peripheral surface of the central portion of the gas opening/closing pin and one of an integrally formed washer-shaped boss body portion

(46) is formed at a lower end of the opening/closing pin. Bauer et al lacks the teaching of the streamlined recess not extending around the entire outer periphery of the central portion.

Weisenberger teaches a streamlined recess (30) on a pin member that does not extend around the entire outer periphery of the central portion.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the pin of Bauer et al with the streamlined recess as taught by Weisenberger merely to provide a communication channel adjacent the port and to cut down on the machining costs.

In re claim 5, Bauer et al teaches the pin as a bar. The dictionary defines a bar as metal or wood. Col. 3 lines 25-27

Re: claim 7, Bauer et al., as modified, describe the invention substantially as set forth above, but are silent as to the gas opening/closing pin being a non-metal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the pin of Bauer et al to have been made of non-metal to provide a pin that is structurally durable or non-corrosive, respectively, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Re: claim 11. Bauer et al as modified by Weisenberger, describe the invention substantially as set forth above, but fail to show the limitation of the at least one recess

Art Unit: 3683

portion comprising a plurality of streamlined-shaped recesses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the pin of Bauer et al, as modified by Weisenberger, to have included a plurality of streamlined recesses to increase the total amount of fluid flow through the pin since in In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960) the court held that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/30/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the streamlined recess of Weisenberger extends around the entire circumference of the central portion. The examiner is using portion 30 as the streamlined recess. It is advised that applicant amend the claims to cite language further describing the streamlined recess. The streamlined recess of Weisenberger contacts an annular groove that does extend around the entire circumference of the central portion.

In response to applicant's argument that indroduction of the pin of Weisenberger into the device of Bauer et al would destroy the device of Bauer and thus not obvious, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Art Unit: 3683

#### Conclusion

5) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devon C Kramer whose telephone number is 703-305-0839. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor can be reached on 703-308-0830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12/2/04

DK